

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is requested.

Drawings - Figures 1-4 have been amended and are now designated as "Prior Art". Two (2) sheets of drawings are presented herewith for approval.

Claims 1-11, 13-16, 19-20 and 23-26 are now pending. Claims 1, 7, 11, 13, 15-16, 19-20 and 25 have been amended. Claims 12, 17-18 and 21-22 are canceled. No new matter has been introduced by way of this amendment.

The Examiner has objected to the Figures 1-4. In response, Applicant has amended Figures 1-4 to include legends designating these figures as "Prior Art". Applicant therefore believes that Figures 1-4 are now in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d) and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to the specification as to failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the subject matter claimed in claims 1, 23 and 25. With respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that the corresponding antecedent basis can be found on page 3, lines 10-11 in the specification as originally filed. With respect to claims 23 and 25, Applicant has amended the specification to provide the antecedent basis for the subject matter claimed therein. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has objected to claims 15, 21 and 25 due to informalities. Appropriate corrections have been made to these claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10, 13-15, 17 and 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Appropriate corrections have been made to claims 1, 7 and 25. Particularly with respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that it "is unclear as to which conductive region(s) forming the emitter region and which conductive region(s) forming the collector region." In response, Applicant submits that the claim language clearly indicates that there are two possibilities of running the transistor. When the collector region is composed of the internal and external conductive regions, the emitter region is composed of the intermediate conductive region. It is equally possible that the transistor be run in reverse, that is, when the emitter region is composed of the internal and external conductive regions, the collector region is

composed of the intermediate conductive region. Applicant therefore submits that there is no need to further specify which conductive region(s) forms the emitter region and which forms the collector region because one skilled in the art can readily recognize the reversibility of a transistor.

With respect to claims 13, 14, 15, 17, 23 and 26, the Examiner appears to base his rejection of indefiniteness on a common theme, i.e., "it is unclear how conductive regions forming the electrodes (or input terminals) of the transistors". Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are part of the original disclosure and form the teaching that the phrases "electrodes" and "input terminals" are broad enough to include portions of a semiconductor, such as conductive regions. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,794,277 to Holland. Applicant has amended claim 20 to include the text of the allowable claim 21. Claim 21 is canceled, as it is duplicative of the amended claim 20. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 11, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holland. Applicant has amended claim 11 to include the text of allowable claim 12. Claim 12 is canceled, as it is duplicative of the amended claim 11. Because claim 11 is now clearly allowable, so is dependent claim 15. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 16 to include the text of allowable claim 18. Claim 18 is canceled, as it is duplicative of the amended claim 16. Applicant has further amended claim 19 to include the allowable feature of connecting the first and third conductive regions. Claims 17 and 22 are canceled. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 12, 18 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As noted above, claims 12, 18 and 21 have been canceled, as they are now duplicative of the amended independent claims 11, 16 and 20, respectively.

Application No. 10/735,286
Reply to Office Action dated January 11, 2005

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now clearly allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC



Hai Han, Ph.D.
Registration No. 54,150

HXH:lcs

Enclosures:

Postcard
2 Sheets of Drawings (Figures. 1-4)

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

553049_1.DOC

Application No. 10/735,286
Reply to Office Action dated January 11, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 1-4. These sheets, which include Figures 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-4

Attachment: 2 Replacement Sheets